#### From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

## PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL
OF COPIES OF TRANSLATION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT
ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPTER I OR CHAPTER II
OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY)

(PCT Rules 44bis.3(c) and 72.2)

To:

YOSHITAKE, Kenji Kyowa Patent & Law Office, Room 323, Fuji Bldg. 2-3, Marunouchi 3-chome

Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 1000005 JAPON

OCT 2 0, 2006

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

12 October 2006 (12.10.2006)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 152957-303

International application No. PCT/JP2005/003989

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION

International filing date (day/month/year) 08 March 2005 (08.03.2005)

Applicant

DAI NIPPON PRINTING CO., LTD. et al

	Transmittal	of the	translation	to	the ap	plican	t.
**	I I WAIDAMA COM	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	or compressions			P	-

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I).

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II).

### 2. Transmittal of the copy of the translation to the designated or elected Offices.

The International Bureau notifies the applicant that copies of that translation have been transmitted to the following designated or elected Offices requiring such translation:

#### None

The following designated or elected Offices, having waived the requirement for such a transmittal at this time, will receive copies of that translation from the International Bureau only upon their request:

AE, AG, AL, AM, AP, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DZ, EA, EC, EE, EG, EP, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MZ, NA, NI, NO, NZ, OA, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW

3. Reminder regarding translation into (one of) the official language(s) of the elected Office(s).

The applicant is reminded that, where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II).

It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned within the applicable time limit (Rule 74.1). See Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide for further details.

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Masashi Honda

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70 Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

Form PCT/IB/338 (January 2004)

## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY To: WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) 12.07.2005 Date of mailing (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION 152957-303 See paragraph 2 below Priority date (day/month/year) International filing date (day/month/year) International application No. PCT/JP2005/003989 08.03.2005 31.03.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G02B1/11, B32B7/02, G02B1/10, H05F1/00 Applicant DAI NIPPON PRINTING CO., LTD. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP Authorized officer Facsimile No. Telephone No.

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/JP2005/003989

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement						
1.	Statement					
	Novelty (N)	Claims 1-5	YES			
		Claims	_ NO			
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_ YES			
		Claims 1-5	_ NO			
	Industrial applicability	(IA) Claims 1-5	YES			
		Claims				
2	Citations of multiple					
2	Citations and explanation					
	Document 1:	JP 2001-264507 A (NOF Corp.), 26 September				
	2001; entire text and especially claim 1,					
		paragraphs [0019]-[0022] and [0030]-[0031]				
	Document 2:					
	12 February 2002; entire text and especially					
	claim 1; paragraphs [0016]-[0017]					
	Document 3: JP 11-326602 A (Dainippon Printing Co.,					
	Ltd.), 26 November 1999; entire text and all					
		drawings, and especially claim 1 and				
		paragraphs [0008]-[0009]				
	Document 4:					
		2000; entire text and especially claims 1				
		and 22, and paragraphs $[0107]-[0121]$ and				
		[0138]-[0139]				
	Document 4:	JP 2004-94007 A (Toppan Printing Co., Ltd.),				
		25 March 2004; entire text and especially				
		claim 1 and paragraphs [0015] and [0018]				
	Document 5:	JP 2000-111706 A (Fuji Photo Film Co.,				
		Ltd.), 21 April 2000; entire text and all				
		drawings, and especially claim 1 and				
		paragraphs [0014] and [0023]				
	Document 6:	JP 9-203810 A (Konica Corp.), 5 August 1997;				
		entire text and especially paragraphs [0015]				

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/JP2005/003989

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

differences in refractive index between the layers in a laminate with objectives such as decreasing interference fringes is in itself prior known art, as disclosed in document 5 and 6, for example; and a person skilled in the art could easily apply the aforementioned prior known art described in documents 5 and 6 in the inventions disclosed in document 1 to document 4 in order to avoid the production of interference fringes.

The technique of using a structure containing quaternary ammonium cations as an antistatic agent constituting an antistatic layer is also in itself prior known art, as disclosed in document 7, for example.

### Claim 5

The invention set forth in claim 5 is a specific desired feature, specified solely by a result which achieves a desired performance; and given that the general means for obtaining the aforementioned specified feature is not specially difficult for a person skilled in the art, specification of the aforementioned specified feature is merely a matter of design for a person skilled in the art.

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No
PCT/JP2005/003989

Box No. VIII

Certain observations on the international application

are also not evident.

It should be noted that merely giving some examples which have the aforementioned specific feature cannot be regarded as a disclosure sufficiently complete for the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art.

Therefore, the description does not disclose the specific feature in the invention set forth in claim 5 in a manner sufficiently complete for the invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art; and the description is unclear.